







C H A R G E

DELIVERED TO

THE CLERGY

OF

THE DIOCESE OF LONDON

AT THE VISITATION

IN OCTOBER, MDCCCXLII.

BY

CHARLES JAMES

LORD BISHOP OF LONDON.

EIGHTH EDITION.

LONDON :

B. FELLOWES, LUDGATE STREET.

J. G. F. & J. RIVINGTON, WATERLOO PLACE ; AND HATCHARD
AND SON, PICCADILLY.

1843.

LONDON :

PRINTED BY R. CLAY, BREAD STREET HILL.

TO THE CLERGY
OF THE DIOCESE OF LONDON

THIS CHARGE

PRINTED AT THEIR REQUEST

IS INSCRIBED

WITH

SENTIMENTS OF THE TRUEST REGARD AND RESPECT

BY

THEIR FAITHFUL FRIEND AND BROTHER

C. J. LONDON.

CHARGE.

REVEREND BRETHREN,

I HAVE looked forward to meeting you on the occasion of my fourth Visitation, with mingled feelings of pleasure and anxiety ; of pleasure, as being permitted by the goodness of God to congratulate you upon the Church's increased and increasing energy, and usefulness, and power ; of anxiety, as being sensible that I should be expected to speak, with the authority belonging to my office, upon the most important of the questions, respecting which the Clergy are at this time divided in opinion. These questions are, in fact, so much more urgent than any others which present themselves as suitable topics of an address upon this occasion, that I make no apology for entering upon them at once, without pausing to notice matters of inferior moment.

The questions, to which I allude, relate partly to the doctrines of our Church, and partly to its ritual. It will not be possible for me, in the compass of a Charge, to do more than touch, in a summary manner, upon the principal features of the controversy now carrying on amongst us ; and I must therefore abstain, as far as the nature of the subjects will permit, from lengthened argument and discussion : but you have a right to know my opinions on these matters ; and I shall proceed to state them as plainly and as briefly as I can. This is the first opportunity which I have had of doing so, in an official address to the Clergy, since the controversy assumed a definite and prominent shape ; and I acknowledge that I was not unwilling to pause, and to be silent for a time, in the hope that those, who have been engaged in that controversy, would see the

evils which must ensue to the Church from its continuance, and be led to modify, or at least to keep within their own bosoms, what I considered to be extreme opinions. That hope has unhappily passed away ; and it now remains for me to perform the duty of pronouncing that deliberate judgment which the Clergy of my own diocese are entitled to look for. In so doing, it will be my endeavour, in humble reliance upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit, not to enter into a polemical discussion on the truth of the doctrines, or the propriety of the rites and ceremonies, which will come under consideration ; but to act as an interpreter of the Church's sense as to the one, and of her will as to the other. If these can be clearly ascertained, we can have no difficulty, looking to the relation in which we stand to her, as to *what* we are to teach, or *how* we are to minister : for we have all solemnly promised, at our ordination, to “give our faithful diligence always so to “minister the doctrine, and sacraments, and the discipline “of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this “Church and realm hath received the same.”

But before I enter upon these subjects, and as introductory to them, I think it right to offer a few remarks upon the most important of the questions concerning Church government and discipline, that which relates to the source and validity of our mission, and to the extent of our authority, as ambassadors of Christ, the interpreters of his Word, and the dispensers of his Sacraments. I have so recently made a public declaration of my opinions on the divine institution and authority of the Church, that I need not repeat them on the present occasion. If the view which I have taken of the subject be correct, it follows, as a necessary inference, that in this country the clergy of the national Church, and they alone, are entitled to the respect and obedience of the people, as their lawful guides and governors in spiritual things : that they alone are duly commissioned to preach the Word of God, and to minister his holy Sacraments. But the extent and boundaries of their ministerial authority are points, which admit of a considerable diversity of opinion, even amongst those who do not question its origin or legitimacy. If it be an error, leading to, and partaking of the nature of schism, to deny, or undervalue that authority, it is, on the

other hand, injurious to the cause of truth and unity to exaggerate it, and to stretch its prerogatives beyond that which has the sure warrant of God's Word. Those persons, who are driven, by the overstrained pretensions of the clergy, to question their authority, are almost sure to withhold from them the respect to which they are justly entitled, and to consider priesthood and priestcraft as convertible terms.

There is so obvious an analogy, in the general features of ecclesiastical polity, between the appointment and offices of the hierarchy under the Levitical law, and those of the Christian ministry, that it is no wonder if some persons have imagined, not merely an analogy, but a typical relation between them; the Jewish priesthood being the type, and the Christian ministry the antitype; the high-priest, the priests, and Levites of the one, answering to the bishops, priests, and deacons of the other; the latter inheriting the dignity, privileges, and duties of the former. The Church of Rome, on the other hand, teaches that our Saviour instituted a new and proper priesthood, after the order of Melchizedek. Neither of these suppositions is consistent with the language of Holy Scripture. The priesthood of Melchizedek, and that of Aaron, were typical of that which was borne by Jesus Christ Himself, the great high priest of the world, who fulfilled, once for all, in his own person, every type and shadow of the older economy of God's Church, which bore any relation to propitiatory sacrifice, and to mediation between God and man.

It is apparent from the whole train of argument pursued in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that under the new dispensation Jesus Christ was to be the only sacrificing priest; his death the only proper sacrifice; Himself the only victim. All the offices, authority, and efficacy of the Jewish priesthood, as they pointed to Jesus Christ, and drew all their efficacy from *his* mediation, were finally centered and absorbed in *Him*, beside whom, and after whom, there is no victim, no sacrifice, no proper mediator between God and man. Whatsoever spiritual power, duties, or privileges, belong to the Christian ministry, are derived to it solely from Jesus Christ, as the Head of his Church, the founder of a new spiritual economy, wherein man, being

placed in a new relation to God, requires a different provision of outward means, for the purpose of approaching Him, and obtaining his favour. Our blessed Lord retains, in his own person, the everlasting sacerdotal order of Melchizedek; and he has given to his Church, not a new order of sacrificing priests; but *some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.*¹

We hold, in opposition to the Church of Rome, that the offering of a propitiatory sacrifice to God is not one of the functions and privileges of the Christian ministry. Jesus Christ, *by one offering hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified;*² and we derogate from the absolute worthiness and sufficiency of that offering, if we suppose that any supplementary sacrifices are required for the purpose of propitiation. If *God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself,*³ we need no other reconciler. We have indeed *our sacrifice, and our altar, and our priesthood,* to offer the one, and to minister at the other. But the sacrifice is a spiritual sacrifice, and the altar is figuratively an altar. We slay no victim, we offer no victim slain: but we commemorate the one great and final sacrifice, properly so called, in the manner appointed by our Lord; and we continually present unto God that memorial, with prayer, and thanksgiving, and an offering of our substance, and of ourselves, both soul and body; and so we apply to ourselves, through faith, the results of the one propitiatory sacrifice; and the whole is rightly, but figuratively termed a eucharistic sacrifice, a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

As to our priesthood, let us beware of arrogating to ourselves the character of mediators between God and men, in any sense which implies that we can stand between them and their Judge, except with reference to that mysterious efficacy which belongs to Christian intercession, by whomsoever offered, if offered in faith, and which it is our special duty to offer in behalf of the people committed to our care. At the same time let us be careful to impress both ourselves and them with just notions of the real

(1) Eph. iv. 11.

(2) Heb. x. 14.

(3) 2 Cor. v. 19.

objects and inherent worthiness of our office. It is ours to realize, instrumentally, to those for whom Christ died, the blessings of which the Levitical priesthood administered only the shadows. It is ours to graft them into the body of Christ's Church; to initiate them into the saving truths of the Gospel; to turn their hearts to the wisdom of the just, guiding them to Him who alone can deliver them from the bondage of sin; declaring, as his ambassadors, the conditions and assurance of pardon; and dispensing to his household the spiritual food of his body and blood; to do all this, and on that account to have the chief stations in that household, and to be entitled to the attention and respect of all who belong to it.

Our blessed Saviour's charge to St. Peter, and through him to all his ministers, was, *Feed my sheep*. Whatsoever acts of kindness, or authority, are requisite for the due execution of that charge, with respect to those to whom we stand in the relation of pastors, it is ours to exercise, and theirs to acknowledge and submit to: but in our ministerial acts both of kindness and authority, especially the latter, we are to have respect to the Church's laws and ordinances; and beyond what *they* require, we may not claim obedience. And it is well that it is so: for a spiritual authority, not so limited, in the hands of fallible and imperfect men, would be perverted, as in the example of Rome, to the ends of an intolerable tyranny over the secret thoughts and consciences, as well as the outward acts and observances of those who should be subject to it.

This limitation of our ministerial *authority*, by the laws of the Church to which we belong, extends also to every part of our ministerial *duty*. As the clergy of an integral and independent national Church, we are bound and restricted in the exercise of our functions not only by the general and fundamental laws of the Church Catholic, but by those of the particular branch of it in which we hold office. We are to teach, as our own Church teaches, in her Articles of Religion, and to minister discipline according to the laws by which she has prescribed and defined it.

First as to our teaching; "The Church of England," says Bishop Hall, "in whose motherhood we have all just

“ cause to pride ourselves, hath in much wisdom and piety
 “ delivered her judgment concerning all necessary points
 “ of religion, in so complete a body of divinity as all
 “ hearts may rest in. Those we read, those we write
 “ under, as professing not their truth only, but their
 “ sufficiency also. The voice of God our Father in his
 “ Scriptures, and (out of them) the voice of the Church
 “ our Mother in her Articles, is that which must both
 “ guide and settle our resolutions. Whatsoever is besides
 “ these, is but private, or unnecessary and uncertain.”

If it be asked, In what sense are the Articles themselves to be understood, for they are not all so precisely worded as to shut out all possible diversity of interpretation? we answer, Where the meaning of an Article may seem to be uncertain, we have the Church for her own interpreter in her Liturgy and Homilies, especially the former: and if in some few instances it should happen, that even with that help we are unable to determine, with perfect certainty, the truth which an Article was intended to assert, or, (which is more likely to be the case) the error which it is intended to deny, we are surely to be guided, in our interpretation of it, by the known, or probable, intention of those who framed it; inasmuch as that will determine the sense in which the Article was received at the first, and that in which it ought still to be received, where it has not been contradicted, or qualified, by any later authoritative declaration of the Church's opinion.⁵ It is possible, and I think barely possible, that the words of the 21st, 22d, and 31st of our Articles may be so construed, as to bear the sense which some have lately attempted to put upon them; but it is not the sense which their authors intended; it is not that in which they have been understood by the English Church; and therefore it is not that in which they are to be subscribed or explained.

It has indeed been said, and not lately for the first time, that the Articles of our Reformed Church were drawn up in general terms, that men of different judgments might accommodate them to their own opinions; and that all who, though differing in the branches, meet together in

(4) Epist. Dedicatory to “The Old Religion.”

(5) See Appendix, Note [A.]

the root of the same religion, might be led to agree in them. Such certainly was the device of those who managed the Council of Trent; and such also was said to have been the mind of those who drew up the Canons of the Synod of Dort. But the composers of our Anglican Confession of Faith, it has been well observed, "had not so little in them of the dove, or so much of the serpent, as to make the Articles of the Church like an upright shoe, to be worn on either foot"—"and therefore we may say of our first Reformers, in reference to the present Book of Articles, as was affirmed of them by Dr. Bancroft, then Bishop of London, in relation to the Rubric in Private Baptism, that is to say, that those reverend and learned men intended not to deceive any by ambiguous terms."—"The end they aimed at was, *ad tollendam opinionum dissensionem, et consensum in vera religione firmandum*; which end could never be effected, if men were left unto the liberty of dissenting, or might have leave to put their own sense upon the Articles, as they list themselves."⁶ The King's Declaration prefixed to the Articles, which was made with the advice of the Bishops, enjoins "that no man hereafter shall either print, or preach, to draw the Article aside any way; but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof; and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense."

With respect to all attempts to give to the Articles of Religion a greater latitude of sense than the words upon the face of them will bear, and, especially, all endeavours to make them look towards the errors of the Church of Rome, when they are unquestionably, as to the points of difference between the two Churches, neither more nor less than a solemn and emphatic protestation against those errors, I will express my own opinion in the words of Bishop Jeremy Taylor. Speaking of the different methods, by which wise and peaceable dissenters might be drawn to subscribe, together with churchmen, some common confession of faith, he concludes, "And at last, in such cases, let the Articles be made with as great latitude of sense

“ as they can ; and, so that subscriptions be made to the
 “ form of words, let the subscribers understand them in
 “ what sense they please, which the truth of God will
 “ suffer, and the words can be capable of. This is the last
 “ remedy ; but it is the worst : it hath in it something of
 “ craft, but very little of ingenuity (ingenuousness) : and
 “ if it can serve the ends of peace, or of external charity,
 “ yet it cannot serve the ends of truth, and holiness, and
 “ Christian simplicity.”⁷

The endeavour to give a Tridentine colouring to the Articles of Religion agreed upon by the Council of London in 1562, and to extenuate the essential differences between the two Churches, is a ground of no unreasonable alarm to those, whose bounden duty it is to “ banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines,” and therefore to guard against the insinuation into our Church of any one of those false opinions which she has once solemnly repudiated. It is one of the methods by which the court of Rome has before sought to beguile the people of this country of their common sense. Bishop Stillingfleet⁸ quotes a letter of advice given to a Romish agent, as to the best way of managing the papal interest in England upon the King’s Restoration : the third head of which is, “ To make it appear underhand, how near the
 “ doctrine, worship, and discipline of the Church of
 “ England comes to us (of Rome) : at how little distance her Common Prayer is from our Mass ; and that
 “ the wisest and ablest men of that way (the Anglican)
 “ are so moderate, that they would willingly come over
 “ to us, or at least meet us half way. Hereby the more
 “ staid men will become more odious ; and others will
 “ run out of all religion for fear of popery.”⁹

What real good is to be effected by any attempts to make our Reformed Church appear to symbolize with that from which she has been separated, in some of the very points which formed the ground of that separation, I am at a loss to imagine. Desirable as is the unity of the Catholic Church, lamentable as have been in some directions the consequences of its interruption, earnestly as we

(7) *Ductor Dubit.* B. iii. c. iv. Rule 23.

(8) Unreasonableness of Separation, Pref. p. xix.

(9) Note [C.]

ought to labour and pray for its restoration, we can never consent to reinstate it, by embracing any one of the errors which we have renounced.

Yet there is no other method than that of embracing *all* those errors, by which a reconciliation could be effected between our own Church and that of Rome, which, when it decreed its own infallibility, cut off the possibility of its abandoning a single erroneous opinion which it has once formally sanctioned.¹⁰ If therefore we are to seek for unity in a reconciliation with Rome, we must be prepared to traverse the entire space which lies between us and the Vatican; for not a hair's-breadth will the rulers or doctors of that Church advance to meet us. Read the recently published Letter of Dr. Wiseman on Catholic Unity; and you will see that he stands at the door, and holds it open for those amongst us who profess, as he says, to be conscious "that reunion with the Holy See "will give vigour and energy to a languid and sickly "existence, and who must be prepared to go to the full "extent of sacrifice of personal feelings, necessary to "accomplish so sacred a purpose." He beckons them in with gracious words of commendation, but not a step does he advance beyond the threshold to meet them; not an error does he promise to renounce; not even a glimmering hope does he hold out of any reformation. I believe that his expectations will be disappointed; that the number of those, who are prepared to apostatize to an idolatrous Church, is very inconsiderable. But a greater evil than the apostasy of a few, or even of many, would be the success of any attempt to establish the fact, not indeed of a perfect identity, but of something more than a sisterly resemblance between the two Churches; and to prove, that a member of the Anglican Church can consistently hold all the errors of the Roman, except one or two of the most flagrant, and even *them*, it may be, with certain qualifications.

The question, which concerns the right *interpretation* of the Articles, is intimately connected with that which relates to the *foundation* upon which they rest. If we desire to prove whether the doctrine set forth in any

(10) Note [D.]

11) Note [E.]

Article be true, our single ultimate reference is to the written Word of God ; which we believe to contain all truths, a knowledge whereof is necessary to salvation ; and so to contain them, that by the diligent use of the ordinary means of instruction in the Church, and with prayer for God's enlightening grace, they may be certainly discovered therein. This absolute completeness of the Holy Scriptures, as the source and proof of our faith, I hold to be a vital doctrine of our Reformed Church. It is our duty, in searching those inspired records, to avail ourselves of all the helps to a right understanding of them, placed within our reach ; to ascertain, when it is possible, the sense in which they were understood by the disciples and immediate successors of the Apostles, and which was derived from them to the early Church at large : to take the Creeds received by the Church for our guides : but not to look to *them*, nor to traditions of any kind, as being so necessary, that Holy Scripture, without them, would not have been sufficient to teach all things requisite to salvation.

I think it a mistaken and dangerous position, to maintain, that without the Creeds we could not have discovered for ourselves some of the great doctrines of our faith, that, for instance, of the Holy and Undivided Trinity. To suppose that the Spirit of God dictated the *materials* only of saving truth to be written by his inspired servants, while He communicated the right interpretation of them, *not* to be committed to writing till after a considerable period of time, is surely an hypothesis of the most unreasonable and improbable kind : yet this is the position which must ultimately be taken by those, who maintain that the Bible could not have been fully understood without the Creeds. The Creeds have indeed, *a priori*, a claim to our attention, as having been delivered to us by the Church : but they are entitled to our assent no further than as they are contained in Holy Scripture, or may be proved thereby. This is the ground upon which our own Church requires us to receive and believe the Creeds, "that they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture."¹² I set a very high

value upon those ancient formularies of catholic belief: but I am firmly persuaded, that if no such formularies had ever been drawn out, all the essential doctrines of Christianity would have been discoverable in the Bible. The implement, with which the secrets of God are to be dug out of the mine of his written Word, is not tradition; but a plain and rightly informed understanding, guided by an honest and good heart, and aided by the Holy Spirit.

At the same time, tradition is of excellent use, in establishing historical facts, as, for example, the appointment of bishops to govern all the Churches, and of the Lord's day, as the day of public worship; the general prevalence of infant baptism, and some other points; in teaching us the practical inferences, drawn by the primitive Church from the truths declared in Holy Scripture, and so guiding us to its interpretation of Holy Scripture itself, such as the right of our Saviour to divine worship, and the implied assertion of a Trinity of Persons in the form of baptism; and in making us historically acquainted with the belief of that Church in general; with which belief if our own be found to coincide, we have, not an absolute proof, but a very strong presumptive evidence, of its being indeed that *faith which was once delivered unto the saints*.¹³

I have already observed, that in the interpretation of the Articles which relate more immediately to doctrine, our surest guide is the Liturgy. It may safely be pronounced of any explanation of an Article, which cannot be reconciled with the plain language of the Offices for public worship, that it is not the doctrine of the Church. The opinion, for instance, which denies baptismal regeneration, might possibly, though not without great difficulty, be reconciled with the language of the 27th Article: but by no stretch of ingenuity, nor latitude of explanation, can it be brought to agree with the plain, unqualified language of the Offices for Baptism and Confirmation.¹⁴ A question may properly be raised as to the sense in which the term Regeneration was used in the early Church, and by our own Reformers: but that regenera-

(13) Jude 3.

(14) Note [F.]

tion does actually take place in baptism, is most undoubtedly the doctrine of the English Church: and I do not understand how any clergyman, who uses the Office for Baptism, which he has bound himself to use, and which he cannot alter nor mutilate without a breach of good faith, can deny, that, in some sense or other, baptism is indeed *the laver of regeneration*.

I will mention an instance, in which the language of the Liturgy not only explains, but in some sense corrects, that of an Article. The 11th Article says that "we are accounted righteous before God, only for the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works and deservings: wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." Now although we may be said to be justified *per fidem*, it is not theologically correct to say that we are justified *by faith*. We are justified, that is, pardoned, and treated as innocent, by God Himself, of his free mercy, on account of the merits of Jesus Christ; and *through* faith we apply that pardon to ourselves. This is accurately expressed in the Post-Communion Service; "most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and *through* faith in his blood, we, and all thy whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion." And lest we should fall into the error of supposing that justification, (that is, the being accounted and dealt with as innocent, or acquitted, in the sight of God) purchased for all by the blood of Christ, is applied to himself by each individual believer, by a simple internal act of faith, without the intervention of the Sacraments ordained by Christ, and generally necessary to salvation, the Church prays, in her baptismal Office, that the person baptized "may receive remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration;" that the water of baptism may be "sanctified, to the mystical washing away of sin;" and, in the case of an infant, thanks God that he has regenerated it, when baptized, and "received it for his own child by adoption." I cannot, therefore, deny it to be the plain doctrine of our Church, that baptism is instrumentally connected with justification, as the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper undoubtedly is with sanctifi-

cation, and the renewal of our mystical union with Christ : nor do I see that the assertion of this instrumental connexion in any way derogates from the necessity or efficacy of faith in the process of justification.¹⁵

The doctrine of our Church, as to the Christian's spiritual life, has always appeared to me to be this: Justification begins in baptism, when the children of wrath are regenerated by water and the Holy Ghost, and are made children of God. Remission of sins is expressly declared to be *then* given: and remission of sins implies justification, in the proper sense of the term. Grace is also then given; and by virtue of that grace the person receiving it, and thenceforth using and improving it, continues to believe in the atonement made by Jesus Christ, and to seek for and realize the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, and to be renewed day by day in the inner man. As long as he does this, he continues in a state of justification: his sins, which cleave even to the regenerate, are forgiven, as they are repented of and forsaken; and the work of sanctification goes on. Righteousness, in a qualified sense, is imparted by the same grace which justifies: but this inherent righteousness does not constitute justification either wholly or in part. Our Article says, not that we are *made* righteous, but that we are *counted* righteous before God. If indeed we are *made* righteous, we must of course be *accounted* righteous; but it does not follow, conversely, that if we are accounted righteous, we must be made so. The notion that God accounts us righteous, by reason, and for the sake of any actual righteousness, wrought in us by infused and inherent grace, seems to be irreconcilable with the language of our Article, "*only* for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and *not* for our own works and deservings:" "by faith only," or, as the Homily expresses it, "by only faith," that is, freely and gratuitously, *without works*, according to St. Paul's statement.¹⁶ Not that we can be saved without works; but *they* are not *the* meritorious cause, nor *a* meritorious cause, of our justification. "Faith alone saves us," as Chillingworth says, "but not that faith which is alone." "Justification," says Barrow, "cannot

(15) Note [G.]

(16) Rom. iv. 6.

“be understood for a constituting a man intrinsically
 “righteous, or infusing worthy qualities into him; but
 “rather for an act of God, terminated upon a man, as
 “altogether unworthy of God’s love, as impious, as an
 “enemy, as a pure object of mercy.”¹⁷

If there were any doubt as to the sense of our Church, as expressed in the 11th Article, it would be removed by the language of the 12th, which declares that “good works
 “are the fruits of faith, and follow after justification; and
 “yet that they cannot put away men’s sins, and endure
 “the severity of God’s judgments.” In other words, they cannot justify, wholly or in part. Yet good works are, by the gracious appointment of God, objects of reward. Jesus Christ died to procure the *justification* of sinners; but also to purchase for them the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, whereby they are *sanctified*; that finally they may be *saved*, and admitted to degrees of bliss and glory, proportioned to their improvement of grace given.

Now if justification, or its results, be, as undoubtedly they are, inseparably connected with faith in the atonement wrought by Jesus Christ, I do not understand how it can be expedient, or lawful, for us, who are to *declare* to our people *all the counsel of God*, to practise any thing of that reserve, which was practised by the early teachers of Christianity; and to forbear from pressing upon the less advanced of our hearers the most sublime and mysterious doctrines of the Gospel. But in truth the reserve of the early (not the primitive) Fathers of the Church, was different, if not as to its subjects, yet certainly as to its objects, from that which appears to be now recommended: and supposing it to have been prudent and commendable in *them*, it by no means follows, that it is expedient, or proper, in the present state of the Church.

The doctrine of the Atonement, and that of a Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the Godhead, mysteries, be it remembered, to the highest order of intellect, as well as to the weakest understanding, and to be received by both with child-like simplicity of faith, furnish, when properly set forth, the most affecting and constraining motives to humility, repentance, and holiness of life: and with

respect to the former more especially, I cannot conceive that any teaching, in which it does not occupy a prominent and conspicuous place, can be effectual in *turning the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just*.

If indeed the reserve, which is recommended to us, be nothing more than a cautious and reverent abstaining from a too familiar mode of treating the sacred and sublime mysteries of our religion ; or from such an inculcation of them, as may tend to throw into the shade its practical duties, and lead men so to contemplate the attributes, or secret things of God, as to forget or undervalue his commands, I readily admit the necessity of *such* a reserve : but any thing of the nature of a *disciplina arcani* I as promptly reject.

I now proceed to offer some observations upon the duty of complying with the Church's directions in the celebration of divine service. Our proper rules in this respect are the Rubric and Canons, as the Articles are, with regard to doctrine ; and we are bound to observe the rule in the one case, as in the other, although it must be acknowledged, that a departure from the truth is more injurious in its consequences, than a deviation from the prescribed ritual. Now it is impossible to deny, that a great degree of laxity has crept over us in this matter ; and we are much indebted to those learned and pious men, who have forcibly recalled our attention to a branch of duty, too long imperfectly performed. In some instances indeed they have gone beyond the line of duty and of prudence, in recommending, or practising, ceremonies and forms, not authorized by their own Church ; and in ascribing to others an importance which does not properly belong to them : but there can be no doubt of their having mainly contributed to the progress, which has been made during the last few years, towards a full and exact observance of the Church's rubrical injunctions, as well as to a better understanding of the foundations and proportions of her polity, and the nature and value of her discipline. We ought not to overlook the real good, which they have effected in one direction, while we contemplate with apprehension the evil, which it is to be feared they have wrought in another.

Every clergyman is bound, by the plainest obligations

of duty, to obey the directions of the Rubric.¹⁸ For conforming to them, in every particular, he needs no other authority than that of the Rubric itself. We ought not to be deterred from a scrupulous observance of the rites and customs, prescribed or sanctioned by our Church, by a dread of being thought too careful about the externals of religion. If we are not to go *beyond* her ritual, at least we ought not to *fall short* of it; nor to make her public services less frequent, nor more naked and inexpressive, than she intends them to be. In saying this, I am not holding any new language. In my Charge to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chester in 1825, I used these words. "A strict and punctual conformity with the Liturgy and Articles of our Church is a duty, to which we have bound ourselves by a solemn promise, and which, while we continue in its ministry, we must scrupulously fulfil. Conformity to the Liturgy implies, of course, an exact observance of the Rubric. We are no more at liberty to vary the mode of performing any part of public worship, than we are, to preach doctrines at variance with the Articles of Religion. If there be any direction for the public service of the Church, with which a Clergyman cannot conscientiously comply, he is at liberty to withdraw from her ministry; but not to violate the solemn compact which he has made with her."

An honest endeavour to carry out the Church's intentions, in every part of public worship, ought not to be stigmatized as popish, or superstitious. If it be singular, it is such a singularity as should be cured, not by *one* person's desisting from it, but by *all* taking it up. When I have been asked, whether I approved of certain changes in the mode of celebrating divine service, which were spoken of as novelties, but which were in fact nothing more than a return to the anciently established order of the Church, my answer has been, Far from questioning the *right* of the clergy to observe the Rubric in every particular, I know it to be their *duty*; and the only doubt is, how far are *we* justified in not *enforcing* such observance in every instance?

It may indeed call for the exercise of a sound discretion, in certain cases, as to the time and mode of bringing about

an entire conformity of your practice, in this respect, with the letter of the law : but I cannot, as it appears to me, consistently with my duty, interpose any obstacles, nor offer any objection to its being done. I wish this observation to be understood, as applicable, not only to the administration of public baptism at the time prescribed by the Rubric ; to the reading of the Offertory Sentences, and the Prayer for the Church Militant ; but to the observance of the days, which the Church appoints to be kept holy. I desire more particularly to call your attention to the duty incumbent upon you, of celebrating divine service upon each of the days, on which we commemorate the leading events in the history of our blessed Lord ; not only his Nativity, Crucifixion, and Resurrection ; but his Circumcision, his Manifestation to the Gentiles, and his glorious Ascension. It is my wish, that in obedience to the Church's directions, you should celebrate public worship on all the anniversaries of those events ; on every day in Passion Week, upon the Mondays and Tuesdays after Easterday and Whitsunday, and upon Ash Wednesday. By specifying these particular days I do not mean to insinuate, that the other festivals and the fasts of our Church are not also to be duly kept : but if any distinction is made, those observances, which are appointed in honour of our blessed Lord Himself, and the solemn commencement of our great penitential fast, are entitled to peculiar respect. The reason, which is commonly assigned for the non-observance of some of these holy days, namely, that the people will not go to church even if we celebrate divine service, I consider not to be of such weight as to preponderate against the plain requirements of the law. The people's neglect in this particular, which began in an age when the Church's discipline was sadly relaxed, was perhaps suffered to grow into a confirmed and almost universal habit, by the too great easiness of the clergy in giving way to it ; in not pressing upon their hearers the duty of frequently attending church, and giving them opportunities of doing so. It must needs take some time to overcome that habit ; but the clergy must be the first to attempt it, and they are not to be blamed for making the attempt. Let them do *their* part in carrying out the Church's intentions, and then none of the laity will have

cause to complain of being deprived, by their means, of any one of the opportunities and privileges to which all her children are entitled. "The life and welfare" (says Dr. Thomas Jackson), "as well of Church as of Commonwealth, depend, next under God, on the frequent and fervent prayer of the Church; and to neglect such laws and canons, though made by men, as enjoin us to the frequent and decent performance of such duties, is to transgress all those branches of God's law, which command us to seek the peace and welfare of the Church and Commonwealth, wherein the safety of the King and State under whom we live, and (which is above all) the advancement of God's glory, is concerned."

With respect to daily service, the Rubric directs, that "the curate or minister in every parish church or chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say morning and evening prayer in the parish church or chapel where he ministers." Of the reasonableness of the hindrance, which may excuse a clergyman from the daily celebration of divine service, he must himself be the judge, subject always to the authority of the Bishop, in case he shall see fit to interpose it, and to require such celebration. In many cases it may be difficult for one clergyman to perform all the services appointed by the Church; and that the framers of the Rubric did not intend to insist upon an uninterrupted daily performance of divine service, appears, I think, from the direction given to the curate, that when it is performed, he shall cause a bell to be tolled a convenient time before, to give the people notice. But it is quite clear, that any clergyman who thinks fit to comply with the Rubric in this respect, and has daily prayers in his church, is justified, and more than justified, in doing so. "As we are not excused by," says Dean Comber, "so we ought not to be discouraged at, people's slowness in coming to daily prayers; for their presence is indeed a comfort to us, and an advantage to themselves: but their absence does not hinder the success, nor should it obstruct the performance of our prayers."—"Let our congregation be great or small, it is our duty to read these prayers daily."

In my primary charge to the clergy of this diocese, in

speaking of matins, I expressed a wish that the experiment should be tried, not on Wednesdays or Fridays only, on which days the Litany might still be used at eleven o'clock, but on every day except Sunday, agreeably to the practice of the early Church and of our own in its better ages. In expressing that wish I had in view the parish churches in towns: and where it has been carried into effect, I believe that a considerable number of persons have been found to profit by the opportunities so afforded. I know of no reason why the same practice should not be resorted to in country parishes, where the resident clergymen are desirous of giving full effect to the Church's intentions; although the employments and habits of our rural population may prevent it, for a time at least, from producing much effect. The truth is, reverend brethren, that until the Church's intentions are completely fulfilled, as to her ritual, we do not know what the Church really is, nor what she is capable of effecting. It is the instrument by which she seeks to realize and apply her doctrines; and the integrity and purity of the one may, as to their effect, be marred and hindered, in what degree we know not, by a defective observance of the other.

I would urge this consideration upon you, with an especial reference to the more frequent celebration of the Holy Communion, the most appropriate and distinguishing act of Christian worship. I am persuaded that much of the backwardness and unwillingness to communicate, which the clergy have so much cause to lament in country parishes, has arisen from the practice of having only quarterly Communions. The people are brought to consider the Lord's Supper, not only as the most solemn office of devotion, but as something so mysterious and awful, that the Church can venture to celebrate it only upon rare occasions; and they are naturally led to question their own fitness to receive it. They are reminded of the duty only once in three months; and while they are doubting, and perhaps all but resolved to communicate, the opportunity passes away, and they think no more of it for another quarter of a year. A more frequent celebration of those holy mysteries, with proper instruction on the part of the clergy, would keep the duty of communicating more constantly before the eyes of the people:

the disobedience and neglect, which they practise once a quarter, they will be less likely to practise every month, or every week ; and I believe that in few instances have the clergy multiplied the opportunities of parochial Communion, without increasing the number of communicants. I am sorry to find that the number of parishes in this diocese (principally in the country) in which the Holy Sacrament is administered only four times in the year, is much greater than I had imagined. I trust that when I renew my inquiries, if I should be spared to do so, I shall not find a single instance of the kind. The rule laid down in the Rubric and Canon, that every parishioner should *communicate* at least thrice in the year, seems to have been mistaken by some of the clergy for a direction as to the number of times at which *they* are to *minister* the Holy Communion ; whereas it is obvious, that if every parishioner is to communicate thrice, there ought to be at least six administrations ; for it is difficult for a poor man and his wife, having a family, both to attend church at the same time. I think that in every parish there ought to be a monthly Communion.¹⁹

The reasoning of Bishop Butler on the frequent and decorous celebration of divine worship is so just in a philosophical as well as religious point of view, that I cannot forbear from adducing it, even at the risk of wearying your patience. The times are so peculiar, and the subject engages at the present moment so much of public attention, that I may be excused if on this occasion I exceed the usual limits of a Charge. “ Nor does the “ want of religion,” he observes, “ in the generality of the “ common people, appear owing to a speculative disbelief, “ or denial of it, but chiefly to thoughtlessness, and the “ common temptations of life. Your chief business, “ therefore, is, to endeavour to beget a practical sense of “ it upon their hearts, as what they acknowledge their “ belief of, and profess that they ought to conform themselves to it. And this is to be done by keeping up, as “ well as we are able, the form and face of religion with “ decency and reverence, and in such a degree as to bring “ the thoughts of religion often into their minds ; and “ then endeavouring to make this form more and more

“ subservient to promote the reality and power of religion.
 “ The form of religion may indeed be where there is little
 “ of the thing itself; but the thing itself cannot be pre-
 “ served among mankind without the form. And this
 “ form, frequently occurring in some instance or other of
 “ it, will be a frequent admonition to bad men to repent,
 “ and to good men to grow better, and also to be the means
 “ of their doing so.

“ In Roman Catholic countries, people cannot pass a
 “ day without having religion recalled to their thoughts
 “ by some or other memorial of it, some ceremony or
 “ public religious form occurring in their way, besides
 “ their frequent holy days, the short prayers they are
 “ daily called to, and the occasional devotions enjoined
 “ by their confessors. By these means their superstition
 “ sinks deep into the minds of the people, and their reli-
 “ gion also into the minds of such among them as are
 “ serious and well disposed.

“ Our Reformers, considering that some of these ob-
 “ servances were in themselves wrong and superstitious,
 “ and others of them made subservient to the purposes of
 “ superstition, abolished them, reduced the form of religion
 “ to great simplicity, and enjoined no more particular
 “ rites, nor left any thing more of what was external in
 “ religion, than was in a manner necessary to preserve
 “ the sense of religion itself upon the minds of the people.
 “ But a great part of this is neglected by the generality
 “ amongst us: for instance, the service of the Church,
 “ not only upon common days, but also upon Saints’ days;
 “ and several other things might be mentioned. Thus
 “ they have no customary admonition, no public call to
 “ recollect the thoughts of God and religion from one
 “ Sunday to another.” And then, having spoken of the
 “ care which ought to be taken to repair and adorn churches,
 “ he adds, “ But if these appendages of the divine service
 “ ought to be regarded, doubtless the divine service itself
 “ is to be more regarded; and the conscientious attend-
 “ ance upon it ought often to be inculcated upon the
 “ people, as a plain precept of the Gospel, as the means
 “ of grace, and what has peculiar promises annexed to it.
 “ But external acts of piety and devotion, and the frequent
 “ returns of them, are moreover necessary, to keep up

“ that sense of religion, which the affairs of the world will
 “ otherwise wear out of men’s hearts ; and the frequent
 “ return, whether of public devotions, or of anything else,
 “ to introduce religion into men’s serious thoughts, will
 “ have an influence upon them, in proportion as they are
 “ susceptible of religion, and not given over to a reprobate
 “ mind. For this reason, besides others, the service of
 “ the Church ought to be celebrated as often as you have
 “ a congregation to attend it.” ²⁰

I have cited these passages at length, as expressing the sentiments of a profound thinker and a wise man ; not as deeming it necessary to offer any arguments in justification of those clergymen, who are desirous of obeying all the directions of the Rubric, and of exhibiting to the people what is really the established, though long neglected order of the Church.

The principle involved in the reasoning of Bishop Butler, is applicable also to the observance of those ceremonies which are enjoined by the Church, whether in the Rubric or the Canons. Upon those which rest on Rubrical authority, I need not enlarge ; our obligation to practise them is clearly and unanswerably set forth in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer. With respect to the Canons, as we, who are clergymen, cannot question their *synodical* authority, so we must believe, upon the strength of the highest legal decision, that they are binding as part of the *law of the land* on the whole clergy of the realm ; and although they do not *proprio vigore* bind the laity, there are many provisions therein, declaratory of the ancient usage and laws of the Church of England, which in that respect, and by virtue of that authority, do bind the laity also. Much has been loosely written about the difference, in point of obligation, between the Rubric and the Canons ; the real distinction seems to be, that the Canons may, in certain cases, by competent authority be lawfully dispensed with, but not the Rubric, except where it is specially so provided. In some cases, it may happen, with respect to both Rubrics and Canons, that a literal compliance with them is impracticable ; and to such cases the maxim of *necessitas non habet legem* obviously applies.

∞ (20) Charge to the Clergy of Durham, 1751. Republished by Bishop Halifax in 1786, p. 17.

There are others, in which a Canon has been long and generally neglected, in a matter not of vital importance to the Church, and where such neglect has been sanctioned by those, whose duty it was to require its observance, if they thought it necessary. Such, for instance, is the 74th Canon, on wearing gowns with standing collars, and cloaks with sleeves. "The general reason," observes Bishop Stillingfleet, speaking of that Canon, "continues in force, namely, that there should be a decent and comely habit for the clergy, whereby they should be known and distinguished from the people:" an object, of the importance of which I have on more than one occasion expressed a strong opinion; but which I fear will not be attained, except by some authoritative regulation, to which the clergy, not of this or that diocese, but in general, shall be required to conform. I am, however, of opinion, that the distinction between them and the laity, as to their ordinary dress, should be of a very simple kind, and not such as would be likely to expose them to the ridicule of those whose respect they wish to retain.

As to those forms and ceremonies which are expressly enjoined in the Rubric or Canons, and which, as is said in the 18th Canon, are intended to "testify the people's humility, Christian resolution, and due acknowledgment that the Lord Jesus Christ, the true eternal Son of God, is the only Saviour of the world," I think that upon the principle asserted by Bishop Butler they are clearly reasonable, and that, being enjoined by the Church, they are obligatory upon its members. Such are the various devotional postures prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and the doing lowly reverence when in time of divine service the Lord Jesus is mentioned, as directed by the same Canon; which custom, says Hooker, "showeth a reverent regard to the Son of God, above other messengers, though speaking as from God also; and against Infidels, Jews, and Arians, who derogate from the person of Jesus Christ, such ceremonies are most profitable."

Again, although I do not consider the Canons of 1640 to be binding upon the Clergy, I see no very serious objection to the custom therein commended, as having been the ancient custom of the primitive Church, and of this also for many years in the reign of Queen Elizabeth,

of doing obeisance on entering and leaving churches and chancels; not, as the Canon expressly declares, “with
 “any intention to exhibit any religious worship to the
 “Communion-table, the east, or chureh, or any thing
 “therein contained, in so doing, or to perform the said
 “gesture in the celebration of the holy Eucharist from
 “any opinion of the corporal presence of the body of
 “Christ upon the Holy Table, or in the mystical elements,
 “but only for the advancement of God’s glory, to give
 “Him alone that honour and glory which are due unto
 “Him, and no otherwise.”

But that the clergy, although they are *at liberty* to use this custom, are not *obliged* to do so, even if that Canon be in force, is clear from the words of the Canon itself, which heartily commends, but does not enjoin it. “In the
 “practice or omission of this rite” (it says), “we desire
 “that the rule of charity prescribed by the apostle may be
 “observed, which is, that they who use this rite despise
 “not them who use it not, and that they who use it not
 “condemn not those that use it.” If those persons, who practise these obeisances towards the Holy Table, do so under the notion of a bodily presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, or if the people are led to suppose them to do so, then I consider the custom to be objectionable, and at variance with the spirit of our Reformed Church. If otherwise, the clergy, who observe it, are bound to explain it to the people, in the sense in which it is explained by the Canon.

The same Canons of 1640, declare that the situation of the Holy Table at the east end of the church, being in its own nature indifferent, and that wherein no religion is to be placed, or scruple made thereon, “doth not imply that
 “it is, or ought to be accounted, a true and proper altar,
 “whereon Christ is again really sacrificed; but it is, and
 “may be called an altar, in that sense in which the primitive Church called it an altar, and in no other.” Those persons who hold not simply a *real*, but a *bodily* presence of Christ in the consecrated elements, can scarcely avoid holding also the notion of a propitiatory sacrifice; and to this notion of a *bodily* presence is to be traced a superstitious reverence for the external circumstances of the Eucharist. Our own Church, admitting the doctrine of

a real, though spiritual presence, utterly rejects that of a corporal presence, which, however it may be veiled under obscure or unintelligible terms, is virtually one with the error of transubstantiation. It is expressly declared at the end of the Communion Service, that by the custom of kneeling to receive the elements, "no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine then bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood."

"The ceremonies" (says Bishop Fleetwood) "allowed in practice in the Church, though not enjoined by the Rubric, are such as were used in the Church *before* and *when* the Rubrics were made; and being reasonable, and easy, and becoming, were not enforced by any new law, but were left in possession of what force they had obtained by custom. He that complies not with these ceremonies, offends against no law, but only against custom; which yet a prudent man will not lightly do, when once it has obtained in general."²¹

With regard to worshipping towards the east, there can be no doubt of its having been a very ancient practice of the Church; for it is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria, and by Tertullian. Bishop Stillingfleet, one of the most learned of our divines, considers it to be one of those customs derived from primitive times, and continuing to our own, which there is no reason to oppose, but rather to comply with. "And of all customs," he observes, "that of contention and singularity, where there is no plain reason against them, doth the least become the Church of God."²²

I do not, however, consider it to be the intention of our Church, that the officiating minister, when reading prayers, should turn to the east with his back to the congregation. Bishop Sparrow thinks, that anciently the reading-desk was so placed, that the minister looked to the east, away from the people, to whom he is directed to turn in reading the lessons. But the reading-desk was not known in the early years of the Reformation. It is not mentioned in the Injunctions of King Edward VI., nor in those of Queen Elizabeth, nor in any Canons or Visitation

Articles before the Canon of 1603. The first Rubric in King Edward's Common Prayer-book, orders, that the minister so turn him in reading prayers as that the people may best hear him ; and as the customary place for reading the prayers was then the chancel, at the Communion-table, it is clear that he could not have faced the east.²³ It appears, however, from the proceedings of the Savoy Conference, that it *was* customary at that time for the minister to turn to the people only when he spoke to them, as in the lessons, absolution, and benedictions ; " when he speaks for them to God," it was argued by the Bishops, " it is fit that they should all turn another way, as the ancient Church ever did, the reasons of which you may see in August. lib. 2, de Ser. Dom. in Monte." ²⁴

I myself approve of, as convenient, though not necessary, the arrangement lately adopted in several churches, where the reading-desk is near the east end of the church, by which the clergyman looks towards the south while reading prayers, and towards the west while reading the lessons.

With respect to those ornaments of the Church, about which there is a difference of opinion, where the Rubric and Canons are not clear, the judgment of the Bishop should be sought for. A question has arisen about placing lights upon the Communion-table. Some doubt may be entertained as to the law in this particular. They were forbidden by the Injunctions of King Edward VI. in 1549 ; but they were in use when the first Liturgy of that monarch received the authority of Parliament, and therefore seem to be sanctioned by the Rubric in our present Common Prayer-book. But whether it be so or not, they have always been retained in the chapels royal, in cathedrals, and in college chapels ; and I see no objection to them, provided that the candles are not burning except when the church is lighted up for evening service.

I strongly disapprove of the practice, which, as I am informed, has been adopted by a few of the clergy, of decorating the Communion-table with flowers ; and especially when that decoration is varied from day to day, so

(23) Hamon L'Estrange, Alliance, p. 328.

(24) Dr. Cardwell's History of Conferences, p. 353.

as to have some fanciful analogy to the history of the saint who is commemorated. This appears to me to be something worse than frivolous, and to approach very nearly to the honours paid by the Church of Rome to deified sinners. Such practices as these, which are neither prescribed, nor recommended, nor even noticed by our Church, nor sanctioned by general custom, throw discredit upon those decent ceremonies, and expressive forms, which are intended to enliven the devotion of those who are engaged in the service of God, and to do honour to his holy name. It is well observed by Bishop Halifax, that "there may be too much of form in religion, "as well as too little. The one leads to enthusiasm, the "other degenerates into superstition; the one is Puri-
"tanism, the other is Popery; whereas the rational
"worship of God, is equally removed from either ex-
"treme."

In resisting an exaggerated spiritualism, we must be careful not to incur the charge of materializing religion; and, above all, we must beware of arbitrarily connecting the gifts of God with ordinances of merely human appointment, and of teaching our people to place the ceremonies which the Church has ordained, however significant and laudable, on the same footing as the Sacraments which have been ordained by the Lord Jesus Himself.²⁵ It is very well to speak of them as precious fragments of an ancient, or perhaps a primitive ritual; but we deny that they are to be cherished as anything more than decent and venerable usages; or that we have the slightest evidence of their being divinely authorized portions of the Church's perpetual spiritual sacrifice.

Ordinances and ceremonies, which cannot be shown to have been instituted by the apostles, with a direction for their continuance, are not of perpetual obligation upon the whole Church; as, for example, the appointment of an order of deaconesses, or widows; the anointing of the sick with oil; and some other instances; although if we can prove them to have been used by the apostles, or make it appear highly probable that they were so, they may not be lightly laid aside, nor changed, even by Churches, and not at all by individual members of a Church. This is

the doctrine of our own Church, in the preface to her Book of Common Prayer; and in this respect every one, at least every clergyman, is bound by the laws of his own Church. What they enjoin he is to practise; what they forbid he is to abstain from; what they purposely omit he is not to introduce.

Prayers for the dead, trine immersion in baptism, the kiss of peace in the Eucharist, the mixing of water with wine in the chalice—all these were undoubtedly ancient customs, if not all of primitive antiquity; but they are not recognised by our own Church, and they are, therefore, not to be practised by its ministers. “Let no minister of a parish,” says Bishop Jeremy Taylor, “introduce any ceremonies, rites, or gestures, though with some seeming piety or devotion, which are not commanded by the Church and established by law; and let these also be wisely and usefully explicated to the people, that they may understand the reasons of obedience; but let there be no more introduced, lest the people be burdened unnecessarily, and tempted, or divided.”²⁶

You are not to take as your rule and model in this respect the early Church, nor the primitive Church; but the Church of England, as she speaks in plain and obvious cases by her Rubric and Canons, in doubtful and undecided ones by her Bishops. This is the language of common sense, as it is also of the canon law, laid down by its able interpreter Van Espen: “*Singularium Ecclesiarum ritus atque cæremonialia, sive ritualia, servanda sunt; neque presbyteris, aliisve ecclesiæ ministris, ritum præscriptum immutare licet, eo etiam prætextu, quod contrarius ritus pristinæ ecclesiæ disciplinæ conformior esset, videreturque ad excitandam populi devotionem, necnon ad explicanda mysteria, aptior et convenientior.*”²⁷ I earnestly wish that this rule were kept in view by all clergymen. We should not then have to complain of unwarrantable omissions and alterations of the Church’s service on the one hand, nor of unauthorized additions to her ritual on the other. I confess that I view the former fault with less complacency than the latter. I think that

(26) Instructions to the Clergy of Down and Connor.

(27) P. 11, Sect. 1. Tit. v. c. i. § 24. See Note [M.]

a clergyman, who presumes to omit any part of the offices, which he has solemnly pledged himself to use whole and entire, either through haste, or negligence, or, which is still worse, from a dislike of the doctrine which they assert, offends more grievously against the order of the Church than he who, from a mistaken zeal for antiquity, revives obsolete practices, or is minutely scrupulous in his attention to the externals of religion. It is my earnest wish that you should omit no part of the solemn services which the Church has appointed to be used, whether in the administration of the Sacraments, or in what are commonly termed the Occasional Offices.

With respect to the habits proper to be worn by the Clergy, when ministering in divine service, no question is made, as far as the prayers are concerned; but it is doubted, whether a clergyman, when preaching, should wear a surplice or a gown. I apprehend, that for some time after the Reformation, when sermons were preached only in the morning as part of the Communion service, the preacher always wore a surplice,²⁸ a custom which has been retained in cathedral churches, and college chapels. The Injunction at the end of King Edward's first Service-book requires the surplice to be used in all churches and chapels in the saying or singing of matins, and evensong, baptizing, and burying. And the present Rubric enacts, that all the ornaments of ministers, at all times of their ministration, be the same as they were by authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI. The gown was probably first worn in the pulpit by the licensed preachers,²⁹ and by the lecturers, who preached when no part of the Communion service was read. In the King's Injunctions of 1633, to the Archbishop, a direction is given, that "where a lecture is set up in a market-town, it may be read by a company of grave and orthodox divines, and that they ever preach in such seemly habits as belong to their degrees, and not in cloaks." When there is only one officiating clergyman, and the prayer for the Church Militant is read, which must be read in a surplice, it seems better that he should preach in the surplice, than quit the church after the

(28) Or possibly an *albe*, or close-sleeved surplice.

(29) Note [N].

sermon, for the purpose of changing his habit. It would perhaps be most consonant with the intention of the Church, if the preacher wore a surplice when preaching after the morning Service, and a gown when the sermon is in the evening. Upon the whole, I am hardly prepared to give any positive direction on this point for this particular diocese, although it is certainly desirable that uniformity of practice should prevail in the Church at large.

A more important point than that of the *dress* of the officiating clergyman, is the manner in which he reads the Common Prayer. No person objects more strongly than I do to a declamatory, or dramatic mode of reading; but I do not understand why those clergymen, who seek to avoid that fault, should pass to the opposite extreme of rapid and monotonous recitation, which they describe as reading *plano cantu*. I am aware, that in the old Rubric even the Lessons were directed to be sung in plain tune, as also the Epistle and Gospel. But this was wisely altered. There are certain parts of the service which the Rubric still directs to be said *or* sung; with reference probably to "choirs, and places where they sing," as the Rubric expresses it, and to parish churches and chapels, where the prayers are *said*, and not *sung*. But whether said or sung, it should be devoutly, audibly, and distinctly. The 14th Canon directs, that the Common Prayer "be said or sung distinctly and reverently." Queen Elizabeth's Injunction of 1559, was, "that all "readers of public prayers be charged to read leisurely, "plainly, and distinctly." The writer of the Homily on Common Prayer cites a constitution of Justinian to the same effect: the rule laid down in the *Reformatio Legum* is, "*partite voces et distincte pronuntient, et cantus sit illorum clarus et aptus, ut ad auditorum sensum et intelligentiam perveniant.*" The reason, why so great a stress was laid on the distinct reading of the Church Service, independently of its obvious necessity, was the general prevalence of an opposite practice amongst the popish clergy, many of whom, after they had conformed to the Liturgy, read it as they had been accustomed to read the prayers in their breviary.³⁰

It is much to be regretted, that any of the clergy of our Reformed Church, which justly glories in a form of public prayer, so framed that the people may both understand it, and bear a part in it, should think it necessary, or profitable, or consistent with the Church's intentions, to read it in a hurried and indistinct manner. "It is an absurdity and an iniquity," says Bishop Gibson, "which we justly charge upon the Church of Rome, that her public service is in a tongue unknown to the people; but though our service is in a known tongue, it must be owned, that as reading it, without being heard, makes it, to all intents and purposes, an unknown tongue, so confused and indistinct reading, with every degree thereof, is a gradual approach to it."

It is a subject, my brethren, of still deeper concern, that any of our body, though but few, should evince a desire and longing to revert, not merely to some of the outward ceremonies, but to the devotional formularies of the Church of Rome; that they should speak disparagingly and disrespectfully of our Liturgy, and prepare men of ardent feelings, and warm imaginations, for a return to the Roman mass-book, by publishing, for daily use, devotions and homilies, taken from authors of that Church, and embodying not a few of its superstitions and unscriptural doctrines and practices: that they should recommend, or justify, under any qualification, prayers or addresses to saints, a practice which began in poetry, and ended in idolatry; intercessions for the dead, which our Church, by her formal discontinuance of them, has implicitly forbidden, and which tend directly to the notion of purgatory; and auricular confession, a practice utterly unknown to the primitive Church, one of the most fearful abuses of that of Rome, and the source of unspeakable abominations.

It is a subject of concern, that while they protest in cautious and measured terms against some of the errors of that Church, they should abstain from the plain, uncompromising assertion of her unscriptural, or rather her anti-scriptural character; and spend their lamentations on their own national Church, as sitting apart from the mother of Churches, and in bondage to the powers of this world, rather than upon that system of corruption and

tyranny which drove her from communion with Rome, and which is still maintained by Rome in theory, and, as far as circumstances will permit, in practice also.

Again, it is matter of shame and grief to *us*, and of exultation to our adversaries, that while such men as Hildebrand and Becket are held up to admiration,³¹ men who, if they were sincere, were yet the authors and abettors of evil, the firebrands of discord, and the subverters of civil government, reproach and censure should be cast upon those holy fathers, to whom, under God, we owe our deliverance from an intolerable yoke, Cranmer, and Ridley, and Jewel; as though the occasional errors into which they may have fallen, under circumstances of difficulty which *we* are wholly unable to appreciate, were not a thousand times outweighed by their services to the cause of God's truth and of his Church.

I am far from approving of those public controversial discussions, which, by exaggerated statements, sure to be made in the heat of the moment, and admitting of easy refutation, tend to promote, rather than check the growth of Popery among us. Nor do I think it consistent with truth, to deny that the Church of Rome is a branch, however corrupt, of the Church Catholic; or with charity, to speak more strongly in condemnation of its faults, than the sacred interests of true religion require; but I hold it to be still more inconsistent with both truth and charity, to gloss over its deadly errors, and to smooth the way for their readmission.

Let us not scruple to say of that Church, not for *her* condemnation, but in our own vindication and defence, and for a warning to those who are in danger of being deceived by her delusive attractions, that she is in a state of schism, if not of apostasy; that she has forsaken the true faith, and defiled herself with superstition and idolatry. And let us speak all the more plainly, seeing that she again employs, as her chosen defenders and emissaries, a society of men, bound together by a vow to uphold by all methods, and at all hazards, not Christianity, but Popery; and who, in accordance with that vow, have framed and carried out a system, so hideous in its principles,

so mischievous in its effects, that it well deserves to be described as having embodied the very "mystery of iniquity."³²

The Church of Rome has added to and debased the apostolical "form of sound words;" has superseded the apostolical succession; has mutilated and corrupted the apostolical communion. The character of the Church itself is not altered by that of a few, or many, of its individual members, whose personal graces and virtues at once modify and recommend the principles which they profess. There is scarcely any error of doctrine, however extravagant or dangerous, which has not been held by some persons of unquestioned piety, and irreproachable conduct. Against such a Church we are bound continually to lift up the voice of solemn remonstrance; and, far from being ashamed of the name of Protestant, we ought to show, that a sincere and immovable attachment to the Catholic Church, in its constitution, discipline, authority, privileges, and offices, is perfectly compatible with, or rather is itself a practical act of protestation against the errors and corruptions of the papal Church.

And surely the duty of so protesting is not to be lost sight of, at a time when that Church is boldly reasserting its pretensions amongst us, and affecting to look for the speedy return of our own Reformed Church into its maternal bosom. Its errors are not less opposed to Gospel truth and holiness now, than they were at the time of the Reformation. The doctrines, and practices, which rendered necessary our separation from that Church, are still retained by her, unchanged, unmitigated, unqualified; nor are the differences between us, in essential matters, less at the present moment, than they were in the times of Cranmer or of Jewel, of Taylor or of Bull. We are far from presuming to assert the absolute perfectness of our own Church; but it is not in retracing any of the steps, by which she has receded from the Church of Rome, that she is to be made more perfect; nor by attempting to remodel her upon the doctrine and discipline, not of the primitive Church, but of the Church of the fourth or fifth century, infected as it was with the remains of gnostic

superstition, and the inventions of enthusiastic or ambitious men.

That we are in some respects impeded and trammelled by the nature of our legal connexion with the State is true; and this is itself one consequence which followed from the abuse of the papal power before the Reformation; but this imperfection will in no way be remedied by the resumption of exploded principles or practices; and I cannot help suspecting that the desire of reverting to *them*, with less of impediment than now exists, is one motive with some persons, who are seeking to effect a total separation of the Church from the State. Let us do all that we have at this moment the power of doing, as the ministers of that Church; nay, let us but do all that we are bound to do, and we shall then see what further freedom of action is required. Before we cry out for a reformation of the Church's laws, let us try the effect of those which are in existence, and not complain of the insufficiency of her ordinances, till we have carried into them the spirit which is requisite to give them life and efficacy.

It will not, I think, be denied, that the Church of this country, in point of energy, power, and usefulness, is, by God's goodness, at this moment progressive: strange, that at this very time complaints should be uttered of her wearing the chains of an ignoble thralldom, of her being compelled to mutter in indistinct accents the praises of God, and of her not affording sufficient scope for the indulgence of devotional feelings,—that Church, in which the seraphic piety of Hooker, and Hall, and Taylor, and Herbert, and Ken, and Wilson, felt no deficiency nor restraint.

If instead of such lamentations, alarming our people, and unsettling the minds of our younger brethren in the ministry, we would admonish, comfort, and encourage one another, to be faithful to our dear Mother; and use, in the spirit of diligence and love, all the means and appliances of good which she places in our hands; setting ourselves, as a united band of Christian soldiers, with composed and stedfast resolution, to resist the inroads of Popery on the one hand, and of irregular enthusiasm on the other; if we had but grace to realize, in our own lives and persons, the plain precepts and directions which she has given for our guidance, recommending them by our example to the

consciences and affections of all men, we should discover that there is much less need of alteration than is supposed ; and, at all events, we should know for a certainty in what direction that alteration should be attempted.

Let us be thankful to Almighty God, that the Church, crippled and fettered as she is thought by some to be, has yet had enough of energy and power to vindicate to herself the religious education of the people ; to throw open the doors of her sanctuary to multitudes, who were before excluded from it ; and to send forth within the last two years six additional bishops, to watch over the growth and fruitfulness of her distant branches. I gladly embrace this opportunity of thanking the clergy of the diocese for the prompt and efficient manner in which they gave effect to my suggestion of a general collection at the Offertory on Palm Sunday last, in aid of the Colonial Bishopsrics Fund. The total amount of that collection—more than 8,000*l.*—greatly exceeded my expectations ; and will no doubt operate as an encouragement to the clergy, to adopt, more generally still, the mode of proceeding which I recommended, when collections are to be made for Church purposes. I shall probably call upon them, in the course of next year, to make another effort in behalf of the Metropolis Churches Fund. The money already contributed to that fund, including the subscription for Bethnal Green, has secured the erection of forty-one additional churches ; and where a *church* is built, *schools* for the children of the poor are sure to follow.

It is to this combined provision for the spiritual and moral wants of the people, that the country must look, under God, for the cure of its most dangerous diseases ; and I trust that the time is not far distant, when the legislature of this Christian land will again recognise the duty, incumbent upon it, of doing something to preserve and perpetuate its Christianity, by means of the instrument which has been divinely appointed for that purpose : not to supersede the Church's endeavours, and contributions, and sacrifices ; but to aid and encourage them ; to answer a present demand of instant urgency, which admits not of delay ; and to supply that, which the Church herself will not be able to supply, till her wealthier members shall have been fully awakened to a sense of their Christian obligations.

I should say something here on the subject of education, but that the time forbids, and that I spoke of it in a former Charge. I will merely observe, on the present occasion, that the efficiency of our parochial system will be most materially increased by regular and periodical inspection. With that object in view, I have appointed clerical inspectors of schools in different parts of the diocese; and I trust that no clergyman will object to their visiting the schools under his care, and reporting upon them to me as diocesan.³³

There are still a few points connected with the orderly performance of divine service, which, as I am frequently consulted upon them by the Clergy, I will briefly notice before I conclude.

I think that it is not correct to commence divine service with a psalm or hymn.

The psalms and services had better be said than sung, where the congregation are not sufficiently versed in the knowledge of music to take part in them.

Where a Saint's-day falls upon a Sunday, the collect for the Saint's-day, as well as that for the Sunday, should be read, and the Epistle and Gospel for the Saint's-day, but the Lessons for the Sunday.

The minister should himself give out the psalms to be sung, and all notices that may be lawfully published in church.

The prayers for the Ember Weeks should always be used as appointed.

The responses in the Communion service should be said, rather than sung, where there is not cathedral service.

After the Nicene Creed, the minister should in all cases declare, what holy days or fasting days are in the week following appointed to be observed.

Baptism is never to be administered in private houses, except in cases of urgent necessity; and all such baptisms should be duly registered within the time prescribed by law. This I request you to take as my authoritative direction, as well as what follows:

That you will not permit any clergyman to officiate as

your temporary substitute, or assistant, not being a personal friend or acquaintance of your own, who shall not have first exhibited to me his letters of orders and testimonials; and that no clergyman, serving only one church, omit either Morning or Evening Service on Sundays.

In conclusion, reverend brethren, let us be careful to bear in mind ourselves, and to teach our people, that the outward means and aids of religion are not religion itself; but are so far valuable and useful as they contribute to the great ends of religion, to form Christ within us, to establish the life of God in the soul, and to keep us within the precincts of his grace.³⁴ The more careful we are to observe all the external circumstances of devotion, the more diligently let us cherish in ourselves, and strive to promote in others, those spiritual affections which they are intended to excite and strengthen. And while we *contend earnestly for the faith as delivered to the saints*, and for all the ordinances of God, let us not forget the *more excellent way*; but *put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness*, and pray earnestly, and strive as well as pray, that “all hatred
“and prejudice may be taken away from us, and whatsoever doth hinder us from godly union and concord; that
“as there is but one body, and one Spirit, and one hope
“of our calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one
“God and Father of us all; so we may henceforth be all
“of one heart and one spirit, united in one holy bond of
“truth and peace, of faith and charity, and may with one
“mind and one mouth glorify God through Jesus Christ
“our Lord.”

(34) See Note [S.]

APPENDIX.

NOTE [A.]

IN our attempts to discover the intention of those who framed the Article which forms the subject of our inquiry, we shall derive assistance from the teaching of the earlier Fathers, by whose statements of all the essential points of Christian doctrine, the fathers of our Reformed Church constantly declared themselves willing to abide. I think it right to repeat here, what I had thought was so plainly stated in the Charge itself, as not to be liable to misconception, that my purpose, in this Charge, is to point out, as clearly as I can, what the doctrine of the Church of England is, as set forth in its authorized formularies; and not to discuss the truth of the doctrine itself. To say, therefore, that my statements respecting the effects of baptism are unscriptural, is altogether beside the purpose. Are they, or are they not, in conformity with the teaching of the Church? I state, that the children of wrath are made in baptism the children of God. It is denied that "children are brought to the font as the children of wrath." But what says the Catechism? "Being by nature born in sin, and the *children of wrath*, we are *hereby* made the children of grace."

To prove that the connexion of baptism with justification is a tenet of our Church, I need only refer to its adoption of the Nicene Creed. The Homily of the Salvation of Mankind says, "We must trust only in God's mercy, and that sacrifice which our High Priest and Saviour Christ Jesus, the Son of God, once offered for us upon the cross, to obtain thereby God's grace, and remission, as well of our original sin in baptism, as of all actual sin committed by us after our baptism, if we truly repent, and unfeignedly turn to him again."—"Our office is, not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully and idly, after that we are *baptized*, or *justified*."

NOTE [B.]

This quotation is from Heylyn's *Quinquarticular History*, c. 8, p. 554.

NOTE [C.]

The agents of the Court of Rome in England, who carried on their correspondence through the hands of Secretary Windebank, in the reign of Charles I., "drew a flattering picture of the resipiscence of the Anglican party, who are come to acknowledge the truth in some articles, and differ in others rather verbally than in substance, or in points not fundamental; who hold other protestants to be schismatical, and confess the primacy of the holy see, regretting the separation already made, and wishing for re-union; who profess and pay implicit respect to the Fathers, and can best be assailed on that side." *Hallam's Constitutional History of England*, vol. ii. p. 92. Compare this with the statements, recently published in the Romish periodical *L'Ami de la Religion*, of what is supposed by its correspondents to be now going on in England.

NOTE [D.]

"Touch that (infallibility), and you shake the whole building of popery, even to the foundation, that is, the papacy itself. To secure that, they are brought under this miserable necessity, of holding all for Catholic faith that is once received into the Roman Church." Bp. Lloyd (of St. Asaph), Sermon on the 5th November; an excellent manual for those who wish to know what the religion of Rome really is. It has been lately republished by Mr. Brogden, in his useful Collection of Discourses on the Liturgy and Ritual of the Church.

NOTE [E.]

The Church of Rome "has displayed so systematic a policy to make no concession to the Reformers, either in matters of belief, wherein, since the Council of Trent, she could in fact do nothing, or even as far as possible, in matters of discipline, as to which she judged, perhaps rightly, that her authority would be impaired by the precedent of concession, without any proportionate advantage: so unvarying in all cases has been her determination to yield nothing except through absolute force, and to elude force itself by every subtlety, that it is astonishing how honest men on the opposite side, (men, that is, who seriously intended to preserve any portion of their avowed tenets, not such as Montague or Heylin,) could ever contemplate the possibility of a reconciliation." *Hallam's Constitutional History*, ii. p. 99. When M. Antonius de Dominis, who was not an honest man, professed his intention of attempting such a reconciliation, Bishop Morton "dehorted him: for the Italians would never be persuaded to retract an error." *Bishop Hacket's Life of Archbishop Williams*, p. 103. His account of the whole matter is very instructive.

NOTE [F.]

Nor can it be made to agree with the language of the 9th Article. The English Article says, "There is no condemnation for them that believe and are *baptized*;" the Latin is, "*renatis et credentibus*."

NOTE [G.]

"Sicuti in baptismo semel renati sumus, ita Cœna Dominica ad vitam spiritualem atque sempiternam jugiter alimur atque sustentamur."—*Noelli Catechismus*.

The doctrine that the benefits of Christ's death are applied, not simply by an internal act of faith, but by the sacraments, is the doctrine not of the Church of England only. The Assembly's Shorter Catechism, A. 92 says, "A sacrament is a holy ordinance instituted by Christ, wherein by sensible signs, Christ, and the benefits of the New Covenant are represented, sealed, and *applied* to believers." If the sacraments are "generally necessary to salvation," simple faith, without the sacraments, where they may be had, is not sufficient.

NOTE [H.]

Every Clergyman, before he is ordained, and again, as often as he is admitted to any benefice or office in the ministry, subscribes to the three articles in the 36th Canon; the second of which is as follows: "That the Book of Common Prayer, and of ordering of bishops, priests, and deacons, containeth in it nothing contrary to the Word of God, and that it may lawfully so be used; and that he himself will use the form in the said book prescribed, in public prayer, and administration of the sacraments, and none other." The 1 Eliz. cap. ii. s. 4, enacts a penalty for using "any rite, ceremony, order, form, or manner, of celebrating the Lord's Supper, openly or privily, or Matins, Even-song, Administration of the Sacraments, or other open prayers, than is mentioned and set forth in the said book." The 13 and 14 Car. II. cap. iv. s. 2, says, that as "nothing conduces more to the honour of our religion, and to the propagation thereof, than an universal agreement in the public worship of Almighty God; and to the intent that every person within this realm may certainly know the rule to which he is to conform in public worship, and administration of sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the Church of England,—be it enacted that all and singular ministers, &c. shall be bound to say and use the Morning Prayer, Evening Prayer, &c. in such order and form as mentioned in the said book."

NOTE [I.]

The King's Injunctions given to the Archbishops in 1694, direct "That the Bishops do use their utmost endeavour to oblige their Clergy to have public prayers in the Church, not only on holidays and Litany-days, but as often as may be, and to celebrate the Holy Sacrament frequently." Concerning frequent Communion see George Herbert's Country Parson, ch. 22, and Bishop Stillingfleet's Eccl. Cases, p. 59. The requisition of the 21st Canon goes no further than that "in every parish church and chapel, the holy Communion shall be ministered so often, and at such times, as every parishioner may communicate *at the least* thrice in every year, whereof the feast of Easter to be one."

NOTE [K.]

See the Bishop of Lincoln on Tertullian, p. 402, and on Clement of Alexandria, p. 452. John Gregorie's Works, p. 89. Bp. Stillingfleet's Eccl. Cases, p. 382. Staveley on Churches, p. 155. Joannes Damascenus says, that praying towards the East was *ἄγραφος παράδοσις τῶν ἀποστόλων*. It was however not a *universal* practice. Socrates, Eccl. Hist. v. 22, says that the Church of Antioch in Syria had the altar to the West, *ἀντίστροφον ἔχει τὴν θέσιν*. So the ancient Church of St. Benedict at Paris. See Mabillon Lit. Gall. p. 68.

NOTE [L.]

Bishop Jer. Taylor, Diss. from Popery, vol. x. p. 239, says, "To put our trust and confidence in God only, and to use ministeries of his own appointment and sanctification, is so essential a duty owing by us to God, that whoever trusts in any thing but God, is a breaker of the first commandment; and he that invents instrumental supports of his own head, and puts a subordinate ministerial confidence in them, usurps the rights of God." "The Church of Rome invents things of her own, and imputes spiritual effects to those sacramentals,—which because God did not institute, and did not sanctify, they use them without faith, and rely upon them without a promise, and make themselves the fountains of those graces, and produce confidences, whose last resort is not upon God, who was neither the author, nor is the approver of them." Speaking of the holy water, he says, "And so the simplicity of Christian religion, the glory of our dependence upon God, the wise order and economy of blessings in the Gospel, the sacredness and mysteriousness of sacraments and divine institutions, are disordered and dishonoured; the bishops and priests, inventing both the word and the element, institute a kind of sacrament, in great derogation, to the supreme prerogative of Christ."

NOTE [M.]

See also Bishop Stillingfleet's *Eccles. Cases*, p. 377.

NOTE [N.]

It was proposed in the Lower House of Convocation in 1562, "that the use of copes and surplices might be taken away, so that all ministers in their ministry use a grave, comely, and side-garment, as commonly they do in preaching;" *i. e.* I conceive, when Sermons were preached without the reading of the Common Prayer. *Strype's Ann.* I. i. p. 501.

NOTE [O.]

The Clergy who read in this hurried and indistinct manner were called, in derision, "Mumble-Matins."

NOTE [P.]

An office in honour of Hildebrand (Gregory VII.) was added, by order of Benedict XIII. to the Roman Breviary, in which he is praised especially as "having withstood, as a valiant wrestler, the impious efforts of the Emperor Henry; for having deprived him of his kingdom, and liberated his subjects from their allegiance." This addition was objected to by some of the bishops in France, and suppressed by an *Arrêt* of the Parliament of Paris, in 1735.

NOTE [Q.]

The *Arrêt* of the Parliament of Paris, dated August 6, 1761, condemned the writings of Bellarmine, Molina, Suarez, Escobar, and others, to be burnt by the common hangman, "comme séditieux, destructifs de toute la morale Chrétienne, enseignant une doctrine meurtrière non-seulement contre la sûreté de la vie des citoyens, mais même contre celle des personnes sacrées des rois." Another *Arrêt* of March 5, 1762, spoke of the Jesuits' doctrines, "dont les conséquences iroient à détruire la loi naturelle, cette règle des mœurs que Dieu même a imprimé dans les cœurs des hommes, et par conséquent à rompre tous les liens de la société civile, en autorisant le vol, le mensonge, le parjure, l'impureté la plus criminelle, et généralement toutes les passions, et tous les crimes, par l'enseignement de la compensation occulte, des équivoques, des restrictions mentales, du probabilisme, et du péché philosophique, et à

“détruire tous les sentimens de l’humanité parmi les hommes, en favorisant l’homicide et la parricide, &c.” On the 6th August, 1762, the Parliament proceeded to decree the expulsion of the Jesuits, “comme une secte d’impies, fanatiques, de corrupteurs,” and they subjoined to the Arrêt a regular chronological chain of the crimes, confusions, corruptions, revolts, and murders, which that Order had occasioned in the countries where it was established, down to the very time of its expulsion. My attention was directed to these remarkable documents many years ago by the late learned and venerable Dean of Winchester, Dr. Rennell. Yet this is the Order, which was re-established, together with the Inquisition, by Pope Pius VII., whose predecessor Clement XIV. had declared it to be impossible “that the Church could recover a firm and durable peace so long as the said Society subsisted;” and this is the Order, which directs the education of a great part of the people of Ireland, and of many of the sons of the Roman Catholic nobility and gentry in England. For fuller information respecting the Jesuits the reader may consult *Les Jésuites, tels qu’ils ont été*, or the *Collectio Opusculorum*, Bremæ, 1768, tom. 1. p. 677.

NOTE [R.]

At this part of the Charge I made some observations respecting the remarriage, by Clergymen, according to the rites of the Church, of parties who have already contracted a valid marriage before the Superintendent Registrar. It appeared to me that such a proceeding was irregular; that the banns, in such a case, could not be correctly published; and that a licence, which is a dispensation for banns, could not be granted; and that if the proceeding were allowable in the case specified, it would be also in all cases of Dissenters’ marriages solemnized by any other person than a Clergyman. I am still inclined to this view of the subject: but I have had pointed out to me a form of licence for such remarriage, prepared by the Master of the Faculties, and printed in Dr. Phillimore’s late Edition of Burn’s Ecclesiastical Law, vol. ii. pp. 433, 99; and I therefore suspend my judgment upon the question, till I shall have had an opportunity of further inquiry and consideration.

NOTE [S.]

“Ceremonies are advancements of order, decency, modesty, and gravity, in the service of God, expressions of those heavenly desires and dispositions, which we ought to bring along with us to God’s House, adjuncts of attention and devotion, furtherances of edification, visible instructors, helps of memory, exercises of faith, the shell that preserves the kernel of religion from contempt, the leaves that defend the blossoms and the fruit; but if they grow over thick and rank, they hinder the fruit from coming to maturity, and then the gardener plucks them off.”—*Archbishop Bramhall*, p. 488.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON P. 15.

My statement that the language of the Liturgy in some sense corrects that of one of the Articles, has been perverted into an admission, on my part, that the Articles require correction. My meaning, which is so obvious, that no honest reader can mistake it, is, that the Liturgy expresses the *doctrine* of that Article in language somewhat more correct than the Article itself, and so *explains* the true meaning of the Article.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON P. 17. NOTE [G.]

“ The sacraments are neither empty signs to them who believe, nor effectual causes of grace to them who believe not. The mistake, on both sides, arises from the want of duly considering the nature of these seals, and that kind of union that is betwixt them and the grace they represent, which is real, though not natural or physical, as they speak ; so that, although they do not save all who partake of them, yet they do really and effectually save believers, (for whose salvation they are means,) as the other external ordinances of God do. Though they have not that power which is peculiar to the Author of them, yet a power they have, such as befits their nature, and by reason of which they are truly said to sanctify and justify, and so to save, as the Apostle here avers of Baptism.”—*Abp. Leighton on 1 Pet. iii. 21.*









